



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

26
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/937,251	09/24/2001	Hisashi Kawanabe	029430-486	6738
7590	01/20/2004		EXAMINER [REDACTED]	SERGENT, RABON A
Robert G Mukai Burns Doane Swecker & Mathis PO Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 1711

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/937,251	KAWANABE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Rabon Sergent	1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 26-59 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 26-59 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____ .

1. Claims 37 and 40 are objected to as being duplicates of each other.
2. Claims 26-35 and 50-59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The use of the phrase, "obtainable by", within claims 26 and 50 renders the claims indefinite, because one cannot determine from the phrase just which compositions are "obtainable by" applicants' process and which are not.

3. Claims 36-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Within claim 36, it is unclear if the resin or one of the components has the claimed sulfur content.

Within claim 38, the claimed viscosity is essentially meaningless, because the temperature scale has not been set forth.

Within claim 42, the language, "the polycyclic alicyclic polyisocyanate", lacks antecedence from claim 36.

Within claim 44, the last word of the claim has been misspelled.

4. Claims 33, 39, 44, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Support has not been provided for all of the claimed isocyanate species of claims 33, 44, and 57.

Support has not been provided for the amended subject matter of claim 39.

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 26-29, 33, 34, 36-40, 44-46, 48, 50-53, 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubota et al. ('156).

Patentees disclose a solar cell comprising an insulating, transparent urethane composition that comprises the reaction product of reactants that meet those claimed by applicants. See column 5 and example 6. Given the components of the composition and its utility in the manufacture of optical elements, the position is taken that the claimed properties are inherent characteristics of the disclosed composition.

7. Applicants' arguments have been considered; however, with respect to claims 26, 36, and 50, it is noted that the claims are simply drawn to resins and sealers; therefore, applicants' method of application is considered to be immaterial. Furthermore, with respect to all claims, applicants have by no means established that the compositions cannot be applied by a molding process.

8. Claims 35, 47, 49, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al. ('156).

As aforementioned, patentees disclose a solar cell comprising an insulating, transparent urethane composition that comprises the reaction product of reactants that meet those claimed by applicants. See column 5 and example 6. Given the components of the composition and its utility in the manufacture of optical elements, the position is taken that the claimed properties are inherent characteristics of the disclosed composition.

9. However, patentees fail to disclose the use of the disclosed insulating, transparent urethane composition for any application other than coating solar cells. Still, given the disclosure that the coatings are suitable for protecting electronic devices, wherein a degree of light transmission is required (i.e., transparency), the position is taken that it would have been obvious to apply the composition to virtually any electronic device, including light emitting

Art Unit: 1711

diodes, requiring coatings yielding a measure of protection and having a degree of light transmissibility.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to R. Sergent at telephone number (571) 272-1079.

R. Sergent

January 11, 2004

Rabon Sergent
RABON SERGENT
PRIMARY EXAMINER